

Appl. No. 10/033,716
Amdt. dated August 5, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 6, 2005

Docket No. 10407-559

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed May 6, 2005, the Examiner's claim rejections have been considered. Applicants note that the Examiner has withdrawn the rejection under MacDoran *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,757,916). Applicants have fully considered the entire reference (Goertzel *et al.*) as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the references cited by the Examiner. As such, the Applicants' response is not directed to a specific portion of the cited reference, but rather to the reference as a whole. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections regarding all pending claims and earnestly solicit allowance of these claims.

1. Claim Rejection 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) -- Claims 1-76

Claims 1-21, 23, 24, 26-68, 70-76 are pending in the present application and were rejected, in the Office Action dated May 6, 2005, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Goertzel *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,308,273). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, in order to provide clarification, claims 1, 30, 35, 41, 43 have been amended. The remainder of the claims are dependent claims and, as such, depend from their respective independent claims. For brevity, only the bases for the rejection of the independent claims are traversed in detail on the understanding that the dependent claims are also patentably distinct over the prior art, as they depend directly from their respective independent claims. Nevertheless, the dependent claims include additional features that, in combination with those of the independent claims, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

In response, the Applicants submit that the Goertzel reference does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention, as amended. Specifically, the Goertzel reference fails to disclose a system for enabling remote access to an application server that includes "a number authentication system that provides anti-circumvention protection that prevents activation of a dialer from a location other than the user location." Rather, the Goertzel reference merely teaches that a caller ID mechanism may be used to determine a phone number when a dial-up connection is used. The Goertzel reference only teaches that the caller ID mechanism may be able to distinguish between an intentionally blocked call and an undetectable caller ID. However, the Goertzel reference does not teach or disclose any anti-circumvention

Appl. No. 10/033,716
Amdt. dated August 5, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 6, 2005

Docket No. 10407-559

protection provided by the caller ID mechanism that prevents the activation of a dialer from a location other than the user location. Because the Goertzel reference fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed elements, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-21, 23, 24, 26-68, and 70-76 as anticipated by Goertzel has been overcome.

2. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Claims 22, 25, and 69

Claims 22, 25, and 69 are pending in the present application and were rejected, in the Office Action dated May 6, 2005, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goertzel *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,508,710). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. In light of the arguments submitted in Section 1 of this response, the Applicants submit that the dependent claims 22, 25, and 69 are not obvious in view of Goertzel because this reference fails to teach or suggest disclose a system for enabling remote access to an application server that includes “a number authentication system providing anti-circumvention protection that prevents activation of a dialer from a location other than the user location.” Moreover, the dependent claims include additional features that, in combination with those of the independent claims, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 22, 25, and 69 as unpatentable over the Goertzel patent has been overcome.

Appl. No. 10/033,716
Amdt. dated August 5, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 6, 2005

Docket No. 10407-559

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest and bona fide effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing discussions, it is clear that the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references are such that the claimed invention is patentably distinct over the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of all of claims 1-76 is believed to be in order, and an early Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner should have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 712-8319. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:30 AM to 6:30 PM Pacific Time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 5, 2005

Andrew B. Chen
Reg. No. 48,508
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER & STEINER LLP
1880 Century Park East, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067-1621
(310) 712-8300 telephone
(310) 712-8383 facsimile